



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,725

12/16/2003

Tsunenori Yamamoto

503.39221CX1

3672

20457

7590

07/03/2007

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

officeaction@antonelli.com
dprater@antonelli.com
tsampson@antonelli.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/735,725	Applicant(s) YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeff Piziali	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.138(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/695,174.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/695,174, filed on 25 October 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. The term "almost equal" in independent claims 1, 11, and 24 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "almost equal" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art precisely how close to equal the claimed "time integral values" would need to be before qualifying as "almost equal" values. Could the time integral values differ by 1%? 10%? 50%? Such claim language renders the illumination control process of the instant invention vague and indefinite.

5. Claims 2-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent upon indefinite and rejected base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okumura et al. (US 6,115,018)* in view of *Chen (US 5,592,193)*.

Regarding claim 1, Okumura discloses a liquid crystal display apparatus comprising a pair of substrates, at least one of which is transparent; a liquid crystal layer disposed between the substrates; a plurality of groups of electrodes [Fig. 1; M & N] disposed on at least one of the pair of substrates for applying an electric field to the liquid crystal layer; a liquid crystal display part having a plurality of active elements [Fig. 1; Clc] connected to the electrodes; drive means [Fig. 3; 21 & 25] supplied with display data from means for supplying data [Fig. 3; RGB Signal] to be displayed, for driving the individual pixels [Fig. 1; Clc] of the liquid crystal display part by applying a voltage corresponding to the display data to the individual pixels (see Column 1, Line 50 - Column 2, Line 17), the drive means including data emphasis means for comparing new display data supplied from the means for supplying data to be displayed with previous display data supplied from the means for supplying data to be displayed, and emphasizing and

Art Unit: 2629

converting the new display data to designated display data in response to a result of the comparison and the supplied data (see Column 1, Lines 18-36 and Column 7, Line 60 - Column 9, Line 13). Okumura does not explicitly disclose an illumination unit nor an illumination control means.

However, Chen does disclose an illumination unit [Fig. 3; 64] including a plurality of illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64a-j] for illuminating a liquid crystal display part [Fig. 3; 62]; and an illumination control means [Fig. 3; 66] for controlling an illumination start time and an illumination "on" time of the illumination unit so that a time integral value of a transmission factor (e.g., allowing/blocking transmission of light -- see Column 1, Lines 18-29) for a frame in which the transmission factor is changed due to an overshoot drive (via driver 66) is almost equal to a time integral value of a transmission factor for a frame in which the transmission factor reaches a designated level and stays in a stable state (e.g., "ON" or "OFF" state -- see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Okumura and Chen are analogous art because they are from the shared field of driving liquid crystal displays. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Chen's backlight circuitry and synchronization method with Okumura's liquid crystal apparatus and comparison result, so as to provide a clear, bright image for display.

Regarding claim 2, Okumura discloses in case that any change is detected in the display data by the comparison, the data emphasis means emphasizes and converts the new display data so as to increase the change, and modifies a response of a corresponding pixel of the liquid crystal display part so as to be larger than a value corresponding to an original value of the new

Art Unit: 2629

display data (see Column 1, Lines 18-36 and Column 7, Line 60 - Column 9, Line 13).

Additionally, Chen discloses that the illumination control means controls the illumination start time and the illumination "on" time of a corresponding one of the illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64_{a-j}] of the illumination unit so that a time integral value of an amount of light passing through the corresponding pixel while a display characteristic is changing is substantially identical to a time integral value of an amount of light passing through the corresponding pixel while the display characteristic is stable (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Regarding claim 3, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 2; moreover Chen discloses the illumination control means controls the illumination start time and the illumination "on" time of a corresponding one of the illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64_{a-j}] of the illumination unit so that visual sensation values with respect to the light passing through the corresponding pixel in the course of response and after response are substantially identical to each other (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Regarding claim 4, Chen discloses the illumination start time and the illumination "on" time of a corresponding one of the illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64_{a-j}] of the illumination unit are predefined so as to be equal to average values of optimal values for all the display data dependent on the individual display data according to the response of the liquid crystal display part after data conversion (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 5, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 6, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 7, Chen discloses the illumination start time and the illumination "on" time of a corresponding one of the illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64_{a-j}] of the illumination unit are changed adaptively and determined so as to be average values weighted with the number of display data to be displayed at the area among values dependent on the individual display data according to the response of the liquid crystal display part after data emphasis and conversion (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Regarding claim 8, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 10, Chen discloses the light source includes a sheet-type light emitting element (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 1; furthermore, Okumura discloses the display data is provided as a picture signal [Fig. 3; RGB Signal] (see Column 8, Lines 21-37). Okumura does not explicitly disclose a light source; an illumination unit, nor an illumination control means.

However, Chen does disclose at least one light source [Fig. 3; 64]; an illumination unit including a light amount adjusting part [Fig. 3; 66] for adjusting an amount of light from the light source for a plurality of illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64_{a-j}] of the illumination unit, and an illumination control means [Fig. 3; 66] for controlling an illumination start time and an illumination "on" time of the illumination unit so that a time integral value of a transmission factor (e.g., allowing/blocking transmission of light -- see Column 1, Lines 18-29) for a frame in which the transmission factor is changed due to an overshoot drive (via driver 66) is almost equal to a time integral value of a transmission factor for a frame in which the transmission factor reaches a designated level and stays in a stable state (e.g., "ON" or "OFF" state -- see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Chen's backlight circuitry and synchronization method with Okumura's liquid crystal apparatus and comparison result, so as to provide a clear, bright image for display.

Regarding claim 12, Chen discloses the light amount adjusting part of the illumination unit is transparent to light when a voltage is not applied to the light amount adjusting part (see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 10.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 17.

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 24, this claim is rejected by the same reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 1.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments filed 28 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants contend, "*Applicant's claims have been clarified to recite 'illumination control means for controlling an illumination start time and an illumination 'on' time of the illumination unit so that a time integral value of a transmission factor for a frame in which the transmission factor is changed due to an overshoot drive is almost equal to a time integral value of a transmission factor for a frame in which the transmission reaches a designated level and stays in a stable state.' Support for the clarified features limitations can be found within Applicant's original disclosure, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the specification, and lines 3-11 of page 14. Regarding preclusion of the previously-applied art from supporting a 103 obviousness-type rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the Okumura et al. and Chen references (taken alone, and in combination) would not have suggested any arrangement which would have made the above-emphasized features obvious*" (see Page 13 of the 'Amendment' filed 28 March 2007). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2629

The cited prior art of *Chen (US 5,592,193)* discloses an illumination unit [Fig. 3; 64] including a plurality of illumination areas [Fig. 3; 64a-j] for illuminating a liquid crystal display part [Fig. 3; 62]; and an illumination control means [Fig. 3; 66] for controlling an illumination start time and an illumination "on" time of the illumination unit so that a time integral value of a transmission factor (e.g., allowing/blocking transmission of light -- see Column 1, Lines 18-29) for a frame in which the transmission factor is changed due to an overshoot drive (via driver 66) is almost equal to a time integral value of a transmission factor for a frame in which the transmission factor reaches a designated level and stays in a stable state (e.g., "ON" or "OFF" state -- see Column 4, Line 23 - Column 5, Line 6).

Okumura et al (US 6,115,018) and *Chen* are analogous art because they are from the shared field of driving liquid crystal displays. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use *Chen's* backlight circuitry and synchronization method with *Okumura's* liquid crystal apparatus and comparison result, so as to provide a clear, bright image for display.

By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

Conclusion

9. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2629

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jeff Piziali
20 June 2007